

ANALYZING STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY IN USING WHATSAPP

Analisis Kemampuan Menulis Siswa Dalam Menggunakan Whatsapp

AWWALIYAH FR

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this research are: (1) Whether or not the use of WhatsApp can improve students' writing ability at the second grade students of SMA 12 Makassar and (2) to find out whether or not the students are interested in the use of WhatsApp in writing descriptive text. The research applied quasi experimental design. The subject of the research was the second grade students of SMA Negeri 12 Makassar. The data collected were the students' writing achievement through test (pretest and posttest) and this research was designed into two groups, experimental and control group, each group consisted of 30 students. The results of the data analysis showed that the mean score of the experimental group in post test was 65.2667, while the mean score of control group was 55.4000. It means that mean score of the experimental group was higher than of the control group. Besides, the t-test analysis for the students' score in experimental and control groups revealed that p value or sig (2 tailed) was less than (α) = 0.05, which was $0.000 < 0.05$. Therefore, H1 was accepted and H0 was rejected. Based on the findings of this research, it can be concluded that the use of WhatsApp in teaching descriptive writing was effective to improve the students' writing skill. Moreover, the students more pleasure and interested in writing their descriptive text using WhatsApp than other media.

Keywords : Writing ability, Whatsapp

Introduction

Good communication into the society is the core for building the people togetherness or relationship. In this decade, people face the new technology. In other words, they must know the development of it. English in technology always connects each others. Generally, technology use by all people around the world. According to Ludlow and Duff (2009), the internet has a more dramatic influence on education and than any previous technological innovation because it has allowed of all ages to access education and training programs. Long time ago, people usually use message from letter, telegram, fax, nowadays the adult or children even the parents all of them using mobilephone or smartphone as the important things, one of the function is calling or send a message or sms (short message system). Nowadays, people can take innovation by using technology like sms or Whatsapp (WA). Some benefits using of WA such as sending and taking document, knowing location where the user is. All of them do not need pulse, WA is also different from twitter, facebook which usually use a pulse.

Writing is one factor that support the communication. When people write, they do not write just one sentence. They produce sequence of sentences arranged in a particular order and linked together in certain ways. The sequence may be very short perhaps only two or three sentences but because of the way the sentences have been put in order and linked together, they form a coherent whole. Writing involves coding of a message of some kinds that is, we translate our thought into language (Byrne,1990), as we know that communication consist of two part direct and indirect, the part of indirect usually via one application namely is whatsapp. The function of WA is almost the same as sms (short message system). Writing via WA, can finish the work or assignment finished on time .In digital era of course, people face the quality of modern technology , inovative and wise to use the thing like WA.

Technology has a positive effect on both of the teacher and the learner. Lam and Lawrence (2002) claim that technology provides learners with regulation of their

own learning process and easy access to information the teacher may not be able to provide. The wireless portable devices such as Ipod, Mp3, Smart phones like Blackberry, Iphone and Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs) could provide opportunities to respond to the need of this generation. Evans (2008) more over, applying technologies have been demanded, by most of the modern learners who oftentimes are forced to study anywhere and anytime, for example, at work in the bus or at weekends. He believes that a distinguishable feature of mobile learning or M-learning is the potential to study when travelling on transport.

The effect of WA for make using time effectively and making good learning process, indicators of WA refers to gives the user easy and know the various of media social well to do apply the technology. Using technology doesn't separate in our life, its a tool that makes the learning process available. The technology has become a fixture in many homes around the world, and its influence has permeated into all facets of our lives, including educational settings. This phenomenon has been hailed by many as the wave of the future in which language instruction will be driven by new advances in computers, the internet and mobile technologies (Davis.R, 2006)

One of the most important skills in English is writing. Some educators take electronic messaging usage as a more positive trend and revel in how comfortable today's students are with writing, Raimes (1983) states that writing can help students learn. Through writing students can be reinforced to grammatical students write, they also have a chance to be adventurous with the language to go beyond what they have just learned to say. It is a receptive skill that helps the writer to form the meaning from the sentence made, it can be describe the ideas, information and many vocabularies through technology like WA. Barbara Bass, director of the Maryland Writing Project, points out "For a while, people were not writing anything. Now, people are actually seeing words on phone screens. And that's good" (Helderman, 2003) Linhart (2007) stated that instant messaging and e-mail are creating a new generation of teenage writers, accustomed to translating their every thought and feeling into words. They write more than any generation has since the days when

telephone calls were rare, smartphones allow for a dialogue between reader and writer. They also encourage a community to be built between the readers and the writer. WhatsApp is a way to communicate to an authentic audience. WhatsApp provides a fresh insight that will help to foster knowledge and information sharing. The applications of WhatsApp (WA) is the most popular messenger applications among the college students (Jadhav, Bhutkar, & Mehta, 2013). This application have a lot usages inside or outside the classroom, there are some usage for instance use the text messaging feature to reinforce vocabulary learning and use the text messaging feature for circular writing Thornton and Houser (2003), the activity of circular writing about descriptive text. Where the students create some words based on the instructions of the text. Therefore, the teacher has to know what approach or method/strategy that students are interested is studying, so that the teacher can create even adopt an approach to make an interesting teaching and learning process.

Based on the reason above, this research aimed at investigating two main problems namely; (i) Does whatsapp improve the writing ability of students ? (ii) Does the students interested in studying writing descriptive text by using the whatsapp?

Research Methodology

The method in this research will use quasi experimental method with two group pre-test and post-test design. This research involves two groups. They are experimental and control groups. The experimental group will treat using WhatsApp while the control group will treat using non WhatsApp. The populations of this research are students of SMA 12 Makassar in academic year 2017/2018. The students consist of 60 students.

The sample was selected by using cluster random sampling. One class was chosen as the experimental group and one class for control group. In which intact group, not individuals, are randomly selected (Gay, et.al. 2006:106). It means that

from the nine classes of population, the researcher choose two classes randomly to represent the experimental and control group. Cluster random sampling was more suitable when the population was very large and also the research have much good chance of securing permission to work with all students in several classroom. Class X³ was became experimental group and class X⁶ became a control group. Both of them consist of 30 students. Therefore, the total number of sample was 60 students.

The instrument will use to collect the data, the researcher take the writing test and questionnaire. The students expected to develop their ideas into writing. The writing test gives the pre test and post test, the test is given to experimental group and control group. The pre test will be given to the students before the treatment and the post test will be given after treatment or the action will conduct in order to check their improvement in writing descriptive text which is the function to know the students' content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics in writing descriptive text. The model of test use a subjective test . Questionnaire use to know the students interest on WhatsApp. The students' will assign to select the number of response, namely; 1) Strongly Agree, 2) Agree, 3) Undecided, 4) Disagree and 5) Strongly Disagree.

To collect data of the students writing ability in teaching descriptive text, both experimental group and control group the researcher presents in chronological order as follows: (1) **Pretest**, before conducting the treatment, pretest will give to the students for experimental group and control group. It aims to find out their prior knowledge in English writing ability. The test is subjective test, which involves the aspects of writing ability namely: content, language use, vocabulary, organization and mechanics. **Posttest**, after doing treatment for six meetings, the posttest will give to the both of groups. Experimental group and Control group to find out the students' improvement which intent to know the students' ability in writing descriptive text which functioned to know the students' content, organization, vocabulary, language

use and mechanics in writing descriptive text. The procedure and the materials will be same in the pretest. The result of the pretest and posttest will be calculated in order to measure whether or not the students got progress in writing Descriptive text to make WhatsApp that being compared with non WhatsApp in writing descriptive text. **Questionnaire**, the questionnaire will be distributed to the students to know the students' interest through WhatsApp in writing ability. The questionnaire will be given to experimental group after the posttest. The result of the questionnaire will be analyzed to know whether the students have very high interest, high interest, fair interest, low interest, and very low. Questionnaire is consisted of 20 statements where 10 for positive statements and 10 for negative statements. The data that is collected from the questionnaire will be analyzed in percentage to know the students interest by using WhatsApp in writing descriptive text.

The data from obtain through writing test either from pre test or post test will be analyzed by quantitative statistical analysis by employing the following procedures: (1) Data obtained from the writing test, the data will be collect through the test by using inferential statistic percentage score used to know the students' ability in writing comprehension. The steps in quantitative analysis will employ the following formulas: (a) Scoring the result of the students' test writing, to measure the quality of students' writing score on the five compositions observed (content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics) the data will classified into five classifications by referring to the scoring system as follows:

Table .3.2. Assessing the components of writing through scoring rubric

| | Level | Criteria |
|--------------|---------|---|
| Content | 30 – 27 | Excellent to very good: knowledgeable. Substantive. Thorough development of thesis. Relevant to assigned topic. |
| | 26 – 22 | Good to average: some knowledge of subject,. Adequate range. Limited development of thesis. Mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail. |
| | 21 – 17 | Fairtopoor: limited knowledge of subject. Little substance. Inadequate development of topic. |
| | 16 – 13 | Verypoor: does not show knowledgeable of subject. Non substantive. Not pertinent. Or not enough to evaluate. |
| Organization | 20 – 18 | Excellent to very good: fluent expression. Ideas clearly stated/supported. Succinct. Well organized. Logical sequencing, cohesive. |
| | 17 – 14 | Good to average: somewhat choopy. Loosely organized but main ideas stand out. Limited support. Logical but incomplete sequencing. |
| | 13 – 10 | Fair to poor: non fluent. Ideas confused or disconnected. Lacks logical sequencing and development. |
| | 9 – 7 | Very poor :does not communicate. No organization, or not enough to evaluate. |

| | | |
|--------------|---------|---|
| Vocabulary | 20 – 18 | Excellent to very good: sophisticated range. Effective word/idiom choice and usage. Word form mastery. Appropriate register. |
| | 17 – 14 | Good to average: adequate range. Occasionally errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured |
| | 13 – 10 | Fair to poor: limited range. Frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage. Meaning confused or obscured. |
| | 9 – 7 | Very poor: essentially translation. Little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form. Or not enough to evaluate. |
| Language use | 25 – 22 | Excellent to very good: effective complex construction. Few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition. |
| | 21 – 18 | Good to average: effective but simple construction. Minor problems in complex construction. Several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition but meaning seldom obscured. |
| | 17 – 11 | Fair to poor: major problems in simple/complex constructions. Frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions. Meaning confused or obscured. |
| | 10 – 5 | Very poor: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors. Does not |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| | | communicate. Or not enough to evaluate. |
| Mechanics | 5 | Excellent to very good: demonstrates mastery of conventions. Few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing. |
| | 4 | Good to average: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured. |
| | 3 | Fair to poor: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing. Poor handwriting. meaning confused or obscured. |
| | 2 | Very poor: no mastery of conventions, dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing. Handwriting illegible. Or not enough to evaluate. |

(Adapted from Jacobs, et al. 1981:91)

Table .3.3 Scoring classification of writing.

| No | Classification | Score |
|----|----------------|---------|
| 1 | Excellent | 96 -100 |
| 2 | Very Good | 86 – 95 |
| 3 | Good | 76 – 85 |
| 4 | Fairly Good | 66 – 75 |
| 5 | Fair | 56 – 65 |
| 6 | Poor | 36 – 55 |
| 7 | Very Poor | 0 - 35 |

(Depdiknas, 2008:38)

Table .3.4 Scoring classification of students' interest:

| NO | Series of Statement | Score | |
|----|---------------------|----------|----------|
| | | Positive | Negative |
| 1 | Strongly agree | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | Agree | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | Undecided | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | Disagree | 2 | 4 |
| 5 | Strongly disagree | 1 | 5 |

(Adapted from Gay, et.al., 2006:130)

- a. To collect the data from the questionnaires, they will be analyzed by using the percentages technique. The researcher will use the following formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = Percentage of question response

Fq = item of frequency

N = the total respondent

(Sugiyono, 2009:137)

Table . 3.5. The interval score of students' interest

| No | Interval score | Category |
|----|----------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 85 – 100 | Very high interest |
| 2 | 69 – 84 | High interest |
| 3 | 52 – 68 | Fair interest |
| 4 | 36 – 51 | Low interest |
| 5 | 20 – 35 | Very low interest |

(Sugiyono, 2009:136)

The pre test was writing ability, which used to find out the students' basic ability in writing descriptive text. It described the situation during pre test 4.8.a. Then the post test was writing ability which it used to find out the students' improvement in writing descriptive text. The picture 4.8.b above shows the situation during the post test above.

Table 4.1. Frequency and percentage of the students' pretest of experimental and control group

| Classification | Score | Experimental group | | Control Group | |
|----------------|--------|--------------------|---------|---------------|---------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| Very good | 82-100 | | | | |
| Good | 64-81 | | | | |
| Average | 46-63 | 4 | 13.3 % | 3 | 10 % |
| Poor | 28-45 | 23 | 76.7 % | 21 | 70 % |
| Very poor | 10-27 | 3 | 10 % | 6 | 20 % |
| Total | | 30 | 100 % | 30 | 100 % |

Research Findings and Discussions

The researcher presented the frequency and percentage of the students' pretest in experimental and control group. It shows the improvement of the students in experimental group before giving treatment by using WhatsApp strategy and after the treatment.

Table 4.1. Frequency and percentage of the students' pretest of experimental and control group

| Classification | Score | Experimental group | | Control Group | |
|----------------|--------|--------------------|---------|---------------|---------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| Very good | 82-100 | | | | |
| Good | 64-81 | | | | |
| Average | 46-63 | 4 | 13.3 % | 3 | 10 % |
| Poor | 28-45 | 23 | 76.7 % | 21 | 70 % |
| Very poor | 10-27 | 3 | 10 % | 6 | 20 % |
| Total | | 30 | 100 % | 30 | 100 % |

Table 4.1 shows that the frequency and percentage of the students' pretest score of the experimental group before learning descriptive text through WA and of the control group. Based on the table, it can be seen that a large frequency and percentage of the students are at poor level in writing descriptive text. In fact, 23 of 30 students (76,7%) at experimental group who gain score categorized as poor. Others, 4 of 30 students (13,3 %) receive score classified as average, and none of them could reach good score and very good score in this group.

1) The mean score and the standard deviation of students' pre test in experimental and control group.

The result of students' pre test of experimental and control group are indicated by the mean score and standard deviation. The analysis of the mean score is meant to know if there is a difference between students' score in pre test of experimental and control group. The standard deviation is needed to know how closer the score to the mean score.

Table 4.2. The mean score and standard deviation of students' pre test of experimental and control group.

| PreTest | Group | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---------|------------|---------|----------------|
| | Experiment | 37.0000 | 7.25401 |
| | Control | 33.3333 | 7.67141 |

Table 4.2 shows the mean scores and standard deviation of the experimental and control group before the students are given a treatment. The table above shows that the pretest meanscore of the experimental group is **37.0000** which are categorized as poor category while the pretest meanscore of the control group is **33.3333** which is also categorized as poor. The data indicate that the mean score of the students' writing skill achievement in pretest is not quite different. In other words, they almost have the same ability before they are given treatment. Furthermore, to make the description of the students' ability in writing descriptive text before conducting the treatments more clearly, the researcher depicted the data based on the five components of writing which can be seen in the following table.

4.3 The Pretest Mean Score Based on the component of writing

| Writing Elements | Experimental Group Mean score | Control Group Mean Score |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Content | 40667 | 38667 |
| Organization | 31333 | 29667 |
| Vocabulary | 38667 | 33667 |
| Language Use | 36333 | 31667 |
| Mechanics | 38000 | 33000 |

Table 4.3 above shows the mean score of the students' pretest scores based on the five components of writing. The table indicates that the students' pretest mean scores in each component of the two groups are almost same, it is only differentiated by one number. The fact shows that the students' mean score of the experimental group by content is 40667 while the students' mean score of the control group is 38667. By organization, it is found that 31333 is the mean score of the experimental group and 29667 at the control group. By the vocabulary, the mean score of the experimental group is 38667 while the mean scores' control group is 33667. By language use, it is seen that the students' mean score of the experimental group is 36333 while the mean score of the control group is 31667. The last is about the students' mean score by mechanic. It is seen that 38000 is the mean score of the experimental group and control group is 33000. Based on this description, it is true that the students' ability of the experimental and control group in writing descriptive text are almost alike.

3. Description of the Students' Posttest Scores at the experimental and Control Group

Table 4.4. The Rate Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Students' Posttest Scores of Experimental and Control Group

| Classification | Score | Experimental group | | Control Group | |
|----------------|--------|--------------------|---------|---------------|---------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| Very good | 82-100 | | | | |
| Good | 64-81 | 16 | 53.3 % | 5 | 16.7 % |
| Average | 46-63 | 14 | 46.7 % | 24 | 80 % |
| Poor | 28-45 | | | 1 | 3.3 % |
| Very poor | 10-27 | | | | |
| Total | | 30 | 100 % | 30 | 100 % |

Table 4.4 above shows the frequency and percentage of the students' posttest scores at the experimental and control group after conducting the treatment. From this table, it is clearly seen that 0 of 30 students (0 %) at the experimental and control group none of the students could reach very good score. Furthermore, 16 of 30 the students (53.3 %) are able to reach good score. On the other hand, at the control group there are only 5 of 30 (16.7 %), 14 of 30 (46.7%) students is average in experimental group and 24 of 30 (80%) is average also. The students which is still get poor score 0 of 30 (0%) in experimental group and 1 of 30 (3.3%) for the control group. Based on the findings, it can be assumed that the students' writing ability of the experimental and control group after conducting the treatments are somewhat different and totally improved.

Table 4.5 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Posttest scores

| Post Test | Group | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------|------------|---------|----------------|
| | Experiment | 65.2667 | 7.11450 |
| | Control | 55.4000 | 8.05413 |

Table 4.5. shows the mean score and standard deviation of the experimental group. The post test mean score of the experimental group is 65.2667 which is categorized as good while 554000 is the control group's mean score which is categorized as average category. This indicates that the posttest mean score of the experimental group is higher than the posttest mean score of the control group , $652667 > 554000$. For more obvious about the students' ability after conducting the treatment, the researcher also provided a table that shows the students' writing ability based on the five components as seen in the following tables.

| Writing Elements | Experimental Group Mean score | Control Group Mean Score |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Content | 68333 | 62000 |
| Organization | 62333 | 53667 |
| Vocabulary | 66667 | 56000 |
| Language Use | 63000 | 60667 |
| Mechanics | 66000 | 44667 |

Table 4.6 above shows the mean score of the students' posttest scores based on the five components of writing. The table indicates that the students' posttest mean scores in each component of the two groups are different. The fact shows that the students' mean score of the experimental group by content is 68333 which is higher than the students' mean score of the control group; $68333 > 62000$. By organization, it is found that 62333 is the mean score of the experimental group and 53667 is the mean score of the control group which is smaller than the experimental groups' mean score $62333 > 53667$. By the vocabulary, the mean score of the experimental group is 66667 while the mean score's control group is 56000 which is smaller than the mean score of the experimental group; $66667 > 56000$. By language use, it is seen that the students' mean score of the experimental group is 63000 which is greater than the mean score of the control group 60667; $63000 > 60667$. The last is about the students' mean score by mechanic. It is seen that 66000 is the mean score of the experimental group and 44667 is the mean score of the control group; $66000 > 44667$. Based on this description, it is true that the students' ability of the experimental and control in writing descriptive text after conducting the treatment group are different in the sense that the students' ability of the experimental group in writing text is better than the students' ability of the control group.

the data findings above are not enough to generalize to the entire population and have not been able yet to confirm the hypothesis formulated previously by the researcher. Hence, to confirm the hypothesis and simultaneously answer the first research question, the data were then analyzed through inferential statistics as seen in the following section.

Table 4.7 The Test of Significance of Normality and Homogeneity
in Pre- Test

| Pre-test | Significance | |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------|
| | Normality | Homogeneity |
| Control Group | 200 | 911 |
| Experimental Group | 064 | |

Table 4.7 indicates that the significance of pre-test normality in control group (200) ,experimental group (064) and the significance of pre- test homogeneity (911). If the significance of normality and homogeneity are higher than the level of significance (α)=0,05 thus this research was reasonable to done .In this case the researcher could continue the process of conducting the treatment and analyze the result of research.

After conducting treatment and posttest ,the researcher analyzed t- test (tests of significance)independent sample test. As it was fore explained in procedure of collecting data at Chapter III that the purpose of T- test was to Null Hypotheses (H0) and Alternative Hypotheses (H1) were accepted. It had been known that the level of significance (α) = 0,05 with degree of freedom (df) =(n₁+n₂) – 2, where n =number of subject (30) ,(df) =(13 + 13)-2=24.To analyze t- table in statistic table , it was obtained through the formula

as follow :

$$T\text{-table} = \left[1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \right] = N - 2$$

$$= \left[1 - \frac{0,05}{2} \right] = 60 - 2$$

= 0,975 is the column and 58 is line so the result of t- table is 2000.

The t-test results of pre-test and post-test in term of literal , inferential and critical in the table below

Table 4.8 The Probability Value of t-test of the students' Writing ability

In Pre-Test and Posttest

| | t- table | t- count | 2 Tailed Value (Probability Value) | (α) | Remarks |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| Pre-test in experimental and control groups | 2000 | -1.902 | 062 | 0,05 | Scientific approach cannot improve writing ability or null hypotheses was accepted |
| Posttest in experimental and control groups | | -5.029 | 000 | | Scientific approach can improve writing ability or alternative hypotheses was rejected |

Table 4.9 T –test of component of writing in Pre –Test

| NO | Component of Writing | Pre Test | | | | Remarks |
|----|----------------------|----------|---------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | | T- table | T-count | 2 – tailed Value | (α) | |
| 1 | Content | 2000 | 662 | 510 | 0,05 | H0 was accepted |
| 2 | Organization | | 706 | 483 | | |
| 3 | Vocabulary | | 1929 | 059 | | H0 was rejected |
| 4 | Language Use | | 2146 | 036 | | |
| 5 | Mechanics | | 2024 | 048 | | |

Table 4.10 T-Test of Component of Writing in Post- test

| NO | Component of Writing | Pre Test | | | | Remarks |
|----|----------------------|----------|---------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | | T- table | T-count | 2 – tailed Value | (α) | |
| 1 | Content | 2000 | -2392 | 020 | 0,05 | H0 was accepted |
| 2 | Organization | | -3929 | 000 | | |
| 3 | Vocabulary | | -4066 | 000 | | H0 was rejected |
| 4 | Language Use | | -972 | 335 | | |
| 5 | Mechanics | | -8671 | 000 | | |

2. Data Description of the students' interest

Table 4.11 The Rate Percentage of the Students' interest

| No | Interval score | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|----|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | 85 – 100 | Very high interest | 17 | 56,7 % |
| 2 | 69 – 84 | High interest | 13 | 43,3% |
| 3 | 52 – 68 | Fair interest | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 36 – 51 | Low interest | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 20 – 35 | Very low interest | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 30 | | |
| | Mean score | (Very High Motivation) | | |

Based on the table 4.8 it can be seen that a large frequency and percentage of the students at the experimental group have high interest in learning how to write descriptive text through WA. In fact, 17 of 30 students (56,7%) are categorized as strongly interested, 13 of 30 students (43,3%) are indicated to be interested and none students who is fair, low and very low interested. The findings are also supported by the mean score of the students that is which is categorized as high interested.

Conclusions

The use of WA in teaching english was effective to improve the students' learning skill of class X in SMA NEGERI 12 Makassar. The result of the analysis showed that there was a significant different of students' achievement in posttest between experimental group and control ($p < \alpha = 0,00 < 0,05$). The students's score in each component was improved and it can be seen from the result of the students' posttest. It is proved by the mean score of the students' posttest in experimental group is greater than control group, where the mean score of the students' posttest in experimental group was 65.2667, control group was 55.4000. So that there is improvement on students' descriptive text by using WA. The students of SMA NEGERI 12 Makassar class X were very interested in learning English using WA. It was proved by the mean score of the questionnaire which was. It was classified as very high interest category. Most of the student strongly agree that WA can encourage them to be active in learning English and improved their English ability.

References

- Alsaleem, Basma Issa Ahmad (2013). The Effect of Whatsapp Electronic Dialogue Journaling on Improving Writing vocabulary Word Choice and Voice of EFL Undergraduate Saudi Students. *Arab English World Journal*. Vol.4 (3), 213-225.
- Barhoumi. (2015). The Effectiveness of WhatsApp Mobile Learning Activities Guided by Activity Theory on Students' Knowledge Management. Taibah University Saudi Arabia. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 6 (3), 221-238.
- Byrne, Donn. Ed. 1990. "Teaching Writing Skills". England : Longman Group .Ltd

- Cathy, Ann Radix & Azim Abdoal. 2013. "Using Mind Maps for the measurement and improvement of Learning Quality" (Online), Vol.3, No.1, Caribbean Teaching Scholar.
(<http://media.usm.maine.edu/~lenny/critical%20thinking%20and%20mapping/mind%20mapping.pdf>). Retrieved on 13 January 2014.
- Church, K, & de Oliveira, R. (2013). What's up with whatsapp? Comparing mobile instant messaging behaviors with traditional SMS. Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Human-computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services (pp. 352-361). ACM.
- Davis ,R.(2006)."Utopia or Chaos ? The impact of technology on language Teaching ". *The Internet TESL Journal*.
- DeMaria. 2003. *College Students Interesting their Major*. (Online).
(<http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi MOFCR/is3 37 108836912/>) retrieved 7 February 2014
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (Depdiknas). 2008. *Kriteria dan Indikator Keberhasilan Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan.
- Evans ,R.(2008). The Sociology of Expertise : the distribution of social fluency
- Ekwenchi, et.all. (2015) Smartphone Usage on Nigerian Campuses : Who is doing What on WhatsApp .Anambra State, Nigeria .
- Gay,R,L, Geoffrey E. Mills and Peter Airasian. 2006. *Educational Research* 8th edition:Competencies for Analysis and Applications. New Jersey Colombus, Ohio : Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Harmer, Jeremy.1991. the practice of English language teaching. London: Longman.

- Hairston, Maxim. 1986. *Contemporary Composition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hidi. 2006. *The four- phases model of interest development*. (Online). 41,111-12(
<http://2jlls.org/issues/vol.1/No.2/Nasligunduz.pdf>. retrieved on 7 February 2014.
- Helderman, R.S. (2003,May 20).Click by Click,Teens Polish Writing ; Instant Messaging Teaches More than TTYL & ROFL. The Washington Post,p. B.01
- Jacob, 1981. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Jadhav,D, Bhutkar,G, & Mehta,v.(2013). Usability evaluation of messenger applications for android phones using cognitive walkthrough.
- Ludlow.B.L.,&Duff,M.C(2009).Education Of Distance Education at Virginia University:Past accomplishments,present activities,and future plans, Rural Special Education Quarterly28(3),9.
- Lam ,Y.& Lawrence , G 2002 ,'Teacher –student role redefenition during a computer based second language project : Are computers catalysts
- Lenhart,A., Madden , M., Macgill, A.R., & Smith A.(2007). Teens and social media
- Murniati. 2006. *The Ability of the Students of SMP Negeri 3 Makassar to Use Correct Punctuation*. A thesis S1 UNM.
- Raimes,Ann 1983,Techniques in Teaching Writing .England .Oxford University Press.Inc

- Rambe,P. & Chipunza, C. (2013).” Using mobile devices to leverage student acces to collaboratively generated resources: A case of WhatsApp instant messaging at a south African University “International Conferen ce on Advanced information and Technology for Education
- Riyanto,A .(July 2013).”English Language Learning Using WhatsApp Application “.AkhmadRianto,love for All,Hatred for None. WordPress,the Splendid Theme.
- Sugiyono. 2009. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitaif, Kualitatif, dan R & D (Thirteen Edition). Bandung. Alfabeta.
- Thornton,P.and c.Houser .(2003).”Using mobile web & Video phones in English language teaching : Project with Japanese college students”. In Direction in CALL : Experience, Experiments, and evaluation,ed.B.Morriso, C Green , and G.Motteram,207- 24. Hongkong:English Language centre,Hongkong Polytechnic University.
- Ur,Penny. 1996. *A course in Language Teaching practice and Theory. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.*
- Winkler, Rolfe. 2013. <http://blogs.wsj.com/digits/2013/06/20/whatsapp-surpasses-250-million-active-users/>
- Wikipedia 2013 [http ://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WhatsApp](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WhatsApp) Accessed on 5 july 2013
- [http://searchmobilecomputing.techtarget.com/definition /WhatsApp](http://searchmobilecomputing.techtarget.com/definition/WhatsApp)
- <http://blog.WhatsApp.com/Accessed> 28 August 2014
- <http://hackersejatiaddress.blogspot.com/2016/02/kelebihan-dan-kekurangan-whatsapp.html>